

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6 to 8, 12 and 16 to 19 are currently pending in the present application with claims 6, 7 and 17 being withdrawn from consideration pursuant to a restriction requirement.

Reconsideration of the Examiner's decisions and reexamination of this application are respectfully requested. Entry of this Response is respectfully requested as no claims are amended by this response.

The §103 rejections:

Claims 1, 8, 12, 16 and 18 to 19 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda et al. USPAP 2001/0054049 (hereafter "Maeda") in view of Chen et al. USPAP 2002/0078097 (hereafter "Chen") and Chen et al. USPAP 2006/0282445 (hereafter "Chen '445").

The Examiner's very thorough remarks are appreciated and have been carefully considered. However, as will be explained hereafter, it is believed that the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness in that the combination of Maeda, Chen and Chen '445 fail to teach or suggest every limitation of Applicants' claims.

There is a very basic but fundamental difference between Applicants' invention and the primary reference Maeda. In Applicants' invention, display elements in particular regions of the document are prioritized and then certain of these regions may be displayed, resulting in a changed layout. This is illustrated in Figures 11(a) and 11(b) of Applicants' drawings where in Figure 11(a), there are displayed 10 regions of the original web page while in Figure 11(b), only 4 regions of the web page are actually displayed according to Applicants' invention, thereby resulting in a changed layout. Maeda, on the other hand, discloses providing a means to display the contents of a document using a selected display condition, while preserving the layout of the document. Neither Chen nor Chen '445 supply the deficiencies of Maeda.

Turning now to the limitations of claim 1, discussed are some of the limitations of claim 1 that distinguish Applicants' claim 1 from the combination of Maeda, Chen and Chen '445.

Applicants recite in claim 1:

means for setting a merging relationship among the regions by deciding a merging region, with which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged, from among regions displayed on the digest screen based on layout information for the regions in the document, all of the regions being included in the document;

means for ensuring access to information lost by creating the digest and ensuring said digest fits optimally on said display device;

As noted by Applicants, when regions are merged, information could otherwise be lost but Applicants ensure access to that information which otherwise would be lost. However, as Maeda notes in paragraphs [0130] and [0131] with reference to Figures 24 and 25, "The dotted portion in FIG. 24 is a portion that can not be displayed in the assigned area. If this portion is simply clipped and abandoned, important information...will also be lost." Further, Maeda discloses in Fig. 25 that "the important contents in the node that corresponds to the assigned region are displayed in accordance with the size of the region." Apparently, Maeda displays only the important contents of the document and discards the rest. This is different than Applicants' invention wherein information not displayed is preserved.

Applicants further recite in claim 1:

wherein the means for obtaining the display priorities further comprises:

As the Examiner noted in his remarks, important portions of the documents in Maeda are retained based on their weighted values. However, Maeda prioritizes important portions of the documents and displays them so that the layout doesn't change. Applicants, however, prioritize the display elements so that only certain display elements and regions are displayed, thereby changing the layout of the document. Again, this is a fundamental and basic difference between the present invention and the combination of Maeda, Chen and Chen'445.

Applicants further recite in claim 1:

means for setting a merging relationship among the regions by deciding a merging region, with which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged, from among regions displayed on the digest screen based on layout information for the regions in the document, all of the regions being included in the document; and the region merged with the displayed regions in response to that a detail display of the displayed regions is required.

The Examiner admits that Maeda does not teach these limitations but alleges that Chen teaches these limitations.

Applicants respectfully disagree. A part of the above clause is “deciding a merging region, with which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged, from among regions displayed on the digest screen...”. That is, visible and invisible regions are merged. In Chen, only visible regions are merged and only if one of the regions to be merged contains no data. This is fundamentally different from what Applicants are claiming.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is submitted that the combination of Maeda, Chen and Chen ‘445 cannot teach or suggest Applicants’ claim 1.

Claim 8 should be allowed for the same reasons advanced in favor of claim 1.

Claim 12 should be allowed for the same reasons advanced in favor of claim 1. In particular, discussed are some of the limitations of claim 12 that distinguish Applicants’ claim 12 from the combination of Maeda, Chen and Chen ‘445. In claim 12, it is recited:

a function to set a merging relationship among the regions by deciding a merging region, with which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged, from among regions displayed on the digest screen based on layout information for the regions in the document, all of the regions being included in the document; and

a function to ensure access to information lost by creating the digest and ensuring said digest fits optimally on said display device;

A part of the above clause is “deciding a merging region, with which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged, from among regions displayed on the digest screen...”. That is, visible and invisible regions are merged. In Chen, only visible regions are merged and only if one of the regions to be merged contains no data. This is fundamentally different from what Applicants are claiming.

Further, when regions are merged, information could otherwise be lost but Applicants ensure access to that information which otherwise would be lost. However, as Maeda notes in paragraphs [0130] and [0131] with reference to Figures 24 and 25, “The dotted portion in FIG. 24 is a portion that can not be displayed in the assigned area. If this portion is simply clipped and abandoned, important information...will also be lost.” Further, Maeda discloses in Fig. 25 that “the important contents in the node that corresponds to the assigned region are displayed in accordance with the size of the region.” Apparently, Maeda displays only the important contents of the document and discards the rest. This is different than Applicants’ invention.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is submitted that the combination of Maeda, Chen and Chen ‘445 cannot teach or suggest Applicants’ claim 12.

Claim 16, 18 and 19 should be allowed for the same reasons advanced in favor of claims 1 and 8.

Summary:

In view of all of the preceding remarks, it is submitted that claims 1, 8, 12, 16 and 18 to 19 are in condition for allowance. Further action with respect to the present application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Chieko Asakawa

By: / Ira D Blecker /
Ira D. Blecker
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,894

Law Offices of Ira D. Blecker, P.C.

206 Kingwood Park
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601
Telephone: 845-849-3686
Facsimile: 845-849-3688